

A Geometric Interpretation of Half-Plane Capacity

Steven Lalley
Department of Statistics
University of Chicago *

Gregory Lawler
Department of Mathematics
University of Chicago †

Hariharan Narayanan
Department of Computer Science
University of Chicago

Abstract

Let A be a bounded, relatively closed subset of the upper half plane $\mathbb{H}$ whose complement in $\mathbb{H}$ is simply connected. If B_t is a standard complex Brownian motion and $\tau_A = \inf\{t \geq 0 : B_t \notin \mathbb{H} \setminus A\}$, the half-plane capacity $\text{hcap}(A)$ is defined as

$$\text{hcap}(A) := \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} y \mathbb{E}^{iy} [\text{Im}(B_{\tau_A})].$$

This quantity arises in the study of Schramm-Loewner Evolutions (SLE). In this note, we show that $\text{hcap}(A)$ is comparable to a more geometric quantity $\text{hsiz}(A)$ that we define to be the 2-dimensional Lebesgue measure of the union of all balls tangent to $\mathbb{R}$ whose centers belong to A . Our main result is that

$$\frac{1}{66} \text{hsiz}(A) < \text{hcap}(A) \leq \frac{7}{2\pi} \text{hsiz}(A).$$

1 Introduction

Suppose A is a bounded, relatively closed subset of the upper half plane $\mathbb{H}$. We call A a compact $\mathbb{H}$ -hull if A is bounded and $\mathbb{H} \setminus A$ is simply connected. The *half-plane capacity* of A , $\text{hcap}(A)$, is defined in a number of equivalent ways (see [1], especially Chapter 3). If g_A denotes the unique conformal transformation of $\mathbb{H} \setminus A$ onto $\mathbb{H}$ with $g_A(z) = z + o(1)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$, then g_A has the expansion

$$g_A(z) = z + \frac{\text{hcap}(A)}{z} + O(|z|^{-2}), \quad z \rightarrow \infty.$$

Equivalently, if B_t is a standard complex Brownian motion and $\tau_A = \inf\{t \geq 0 : B_t \notin \mathbb{H} \setminus A\}$,

$$\text{hcap}(A) = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} y \mathbb{E}^{iy} [\text{Im}(B_{\tau_A})].$$

Let $\text{Im}[A] = \sup\{\text{Im}(z) : z \in A\}$. Then if $y \geq \text{Im}[A]$, we can also write

$$\text{hcap}(A) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}^{x+iy} [\text{Im}(B_{\tau_A})] dx.$$

These last two definitions do not require $\mathbb{H} \setminus A$ to be simply connected, and the latter definition does not require A to be bounded but only that $\text{Im}[A] < \infty$.

*Research supported by National Science Foundation grant DMS-0805755.

†Research supported by National Science Foundation grant DMS-0734151.

For $\mathbb{H}$ -hulls (that is, for A for which $\mathbb{H} \setminus A$ is simply connected), the half-plane capacity is comparable to a more geometric quantity that we define. This is not new (the second author learned it from Oded Schramm in oral communication), but we do not know of a proof in the literature. In this note, we prove the fact giving (nonoptimal) bounds on the constant. We start with the definition of the geometric quantity.

Definition 1. For an $\mathbb{H}$ -hull A , let $\text{hsiz}(A)$ be the 2-dimensional Lebesgue measure of the union of all balls centered at points in A that are tangent to the real line. In other words

$$\text{hsiz}(A) = \text{area} \left[\bigcup_{x+iy \in A} \mathcal{B}(x+iy, y) \right],$$

where $\mathcal{B}(z, \epsilon)$ denotes the disk of radius ϵ about z .

In this paper, we prove the following.

Theorem 1. For every $\mathbb{H}$ -hull A ,

$$\frac{1}{66} \text{hsiz}(A) < \text{hcap}(A) \leq \frac{7}{2\pi} \text{hsiz}(A).$$

2 Proof of Theorem 1

It suffices to prove this for weakly bounded $\mathbb{H}$ -hulls, by which we mean $\mathbb{H}$ -hulls A with $\text{Im}(A) < \infty$ and such that for each $\epsilon > 0$, the set $\{x+iy : y > \epsilon\}$ is bounded. Indeed, for $\mathbb{H}$ -hulls that are not weakly bounded, it is easy to verify that $\text{hsiz}(A) = \text{hcap}(A) = \infty$.

We start with a simple inequality that is implied but not explicitly stated in [1]. Equality is achieved when A is a vertical line segment.

Lemma 1. If A is an $\mathbb{H}$ -hull, then

$$\text{hcap}(A) \geq \frac{\text{Im}[A]^2}{2}. \quad (1)$$

Proof. Due to the continuity of hcap with respect to the Hausdorff metric on $\mathbb{H}$ -hulls, it suffices to prove the result for $\mathbb{H}$ -hulls that are path-connected. Further, by the monotonicity of hcap under containment, A can be assumed to be of the form $\eta(0, T]$ where η is a simple curve with $\eta(0+) \in \mathbb{R}$, parameterized so that $\text{hcap}[\eta(0, t)] = 2t$. In particular, $T = \text{hcap}(A)/2$. If $g_t = g_{\eta(0, t]}$, then g_t satisfies the Loewner equation

$$\partial_t g_t(z) = \frac{2}{g_t(z) - U_t}, \quad g_0(z) = z, \quad (2)$$

where $U : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous. Suppose $\text{Im}(z)^2 > 2 \text{hcap}(A)$ and let $Y_t = \text{Im}[g_t(z)]$. Then (2) gives

$$-\partial_t Y_t^2 \leq \frac{4Y_t}{|g_t(z) - U_t|^2} \leq 4,$$

which implies

$$Y_T^2 \geq Y_0^2 - 4T > 0.$$

This implies that $z \notin A$, and hence $\text{Im}[A]^2 \leq 2 \text{hcap}(A)$. □

The next lemma is a variant of the vital covering lemma. If $c > 0$ and $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$, let

$$\mathcal{I}(z, c) = (x - cy, x + cy),$$

$$\mathcal{R}(z, c) = \mathcal{I}(z, c) \times (0, y] = \{x' + iy' : |x' - x| < cy, 0 < y' \leq y\}.$$

Lemma 2. *Suppose A is a weakly bounded $\mathbb{H}$ -hull and $c > 0$. Then there exists a finite or countably infinite sequence of points $\{z_1 = x_1 + iy_1, z_2 = x_2 + iy_2, \dots\} \subset A$ such that:*

- $y_1 \geq y_2 \geq y_3 \geq \dots$;
- the intervals $\mathcal{I}(x_1, c), \mathcal{I}(x_2, c), \dots$ are disjoint;
-

$$A \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}(z_j, 2c). \quad (3)$$

Proof. We define the points recursively. Let $A_0 = A$ and given $\{z_1, \dots, z_j\}$, let

$$A_j = A \setminus \left[\bigcup_{k=1}^j \mathcal{R}(z_k, 2c) \right].$$

If $A_j = \emptyset$ we stop, and if $A_j \neq \emptyset$, we choose $z_{j+1} = x_{j+1} + iy_{j+1} \in A$ with $y_{j+1} = \text{Im}[A_j]$. Note that if $k \leq j$, then $|x_{j+1} - x_k| \geq 2cy_k \geq c(y_k + y_{j+1})$ and hence $\mathcal{I}(z_{j+1}, c) \cap \mathcal{I}(z_k, c) = \emptyset$. Using the weak boundedness of A , we can see that $y_j \rightarrow 0$ and hence (3) holds. $\square$

Lemma 3. *For every $c > 0$, let*

$$\rho_c := \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \arctan(e^{-\theta}), \quad \theta = \theta_c = \frac{\pi}{4c}.$$

Then, for any $c > 0$, if A is a weakly bounded $\mathbb{H}$ -hull and $x_0 + iy_0 \in A$ with $y_0 = \text{Im}(A)$, then

$$\text{hcap}(A) \geq \rho_c^2 y_0^2 + \text{hcap}[A \setminus \mathcal{R}(z, 2c)].$$

Proof. By scaling and invariance under real translation, we may assume that $\text{Im}[A] = y_0 = 1$ and $x_0 = 0$. Let $S = S_c$ be defined to be the set of all points z of the form $x + iuy$ where $x + iy \in A \setminus \mathcal{R}(i, 2c)$ and $0 < u \leq 1$.

Clearly, $S \cap A = A \setminus \mathcal{R}(i, 2c)$.

Using the capacity inequality [1, (3.10)]

$$\text{hcap}(A_1 \cup A_2) - \text{hcap}(A_2) \leq \text{hcap}(A_1) - \text{hcap}(A_1 \cap A_2), \quad (4)$$

we see that

$$\text{hcap}(S \cup A) - \text{hcap}(S) \leq \text{hcap}(A) - \text{hcap}(S \cap A).$$

Hence, it suffices to show that

$$\text{hcap}(S \cup A) - \text{hcap}(S) \geq \rho_c^2.$$

Let f be the conformal map of $\mathbb{H} \setminus S$ onto $\mathbb{H}$ such that $z - f(z) = o(1)$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$. Let $S^* := S \cup A$. By properties of halfplane capacity [1, (3.8)] and (1),

$$\text{hcap}(S^*) - \text{hcap}(S) = \text{hcap}[f(S^* \setminus S)] \geq \frac{\text{Im}[f(i)]^2}{2}.$$

Hence, it suffices to prove that

$$\operatorname{Im}[f(i)] \geq \sqrt{2}\rho = \frac{4}{\pi} \arctan(e^{-\theta}). \quad (5)$$

By construction, $S \cap \mathcal{R}(z, 2c) = \emptyset$. Let $V = (-2c, 2c) \times (0, \infty) = \{x + iy : |x| < 2c, y > 0\}$ and let τ_V be the first time that a Brownian motion leaves the domain. Then [1, (3.5)],

$$\operatorname{Im}[f(i)] = 1 - \mathbb{E}^i[\operatorname{Im}(B_{\tau_S})] \geq \mathbb{P}\{B_{\tau_S} \in [-2c, 2c]\} \geq \mathbb{P}\{B_{\tau_V} \in [-2c, 2c]\}.$$

The map $\Phi(z) = \sin(\theta z)$ maps V onto $\mathbb{H}$ sending $[-2c, 2c]$ to $[-1, 1]$ and $\Phi(i) = i \sinh \theta$. Using conformal invariance of Brownian motion and the Poisson kernel in $\mathbb{H}$, we see that

$$\mathbb{P}\{B_{\tau_V} \in [-2c, 2c]\} = \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan\left(\frac{1}{\sinh \theta}\right) = \frac{4}{\pi} \arctan(e^{-\theta}).$$

The second equality uses the double angle formula for the tangent. □

Lemma 4. *Suppose $c > 0$ and $x_1 + iy_1, x_2 + iy_2, \dots$ are as in Lemma 2. Then*

$$\operatorname{hsiz}(A) \leq [\pi + 8c] \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j^2. \quad (6)$$

If $c \geq 1$, then

$$\pi \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j^2 \leq \operatorname{hsiz}(A). \quad (7)$$

Proof. A simple geometry exercise shows that

$$\operatorname{area} \left[\bigcup_{x+iy \in \mathcal{R}(z_j, 2c)} \mathcal{B}(x+iy, y) \right] = [\pi + 8c] y_j^2.$$

Since

$$A \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}(z_j, 2c),$$

the upper bound in (6) follows. Since $c \geq 1$, and the intervals $\mathcal{I}(z_j, c)$ are disjoint, so are the disks $\mathcal{B}(z_j, y_j)$. Hence,

$$\operatorname{area} \left[\bigcup_{x+iy \in A} \mathcal{B}(x+iy, y) \right] \geq \operatorname{area} \left[\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}(z_j, y_j) \right] = \pi \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j^2.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $V_j = A \cap \mathcal{R}(z_j, c)$. Lemma 3 tells us that

$$\operatorname{hcap} \left[\bigcup_{k=j}^{\infty} V_j \right] \geq \rho_c^2 y_j^2 + \operatorname{hcap} \left[\bigcup_{k=j+1}^{\infty} V_j \right],$$

and hence

$$\operatorname{hcap}(A) \geq \rho_c^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j^2.$$

Combining this with the upper bound in (6) with any $c > 0$ gives

$$\frac{\text{hcap}(A)}{\text{hsiz}(A)} \geq \frac{\rho_c^2}{\pi + 8c}.$$

Choosing $c = \frac{8}{5}$ gives us

$$\frac{\text{hcap}(A)}{\text{hsiz}(A)} > \frac{1}{66}.$$

For the upper bound, choose a covering as in Lemma 2 with $c = 1$. Subadditivity and scaling give

$$\text{hcap}(A) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \text{hcap}[\mathcal{R}(z_j, 2y_j)] = \text{hcap}[\mathcal{R}(i, 2)] \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j^2.$$

Combining this with the lower bound in (6) gives

$$\frac{\text{hcap}(A)}{\text{hsiz}(A)} \leq \frac{\text{hcap}[\mathcal{R}(i, 2)]}{\pi}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{R}(i, 2)$ is the union of two real translates of $\mathcal{R}(i, 1)$, $\text{hcap}[\mathcal{R}(i, 2)] \leq 2 \text{hcap}[\mathcal{R}(i, 1)]$ whose intersection is the interval $(0, i]$. Using (4), we see that

$$\text{hcap}(\mathcal{R}(i, 2)) \leq 2 \text{hcap}(\mathcal{R}(i, 1)) - \text{hcap}((0, i]) = 2 \text{hcap}(\mathcal{R}(i, 1)) - \frac{1}{2}.$$

But $\mathcal{R}(i, 1)$ is strictly contained in $A' := \{z \in \mathbb{H} : |z| \leq \sqrt{2}\}$, and hence

$$\text{hcap}[\mathcal{R}(i, 1)] < \text{hcap}(A') = 2.$$

The last equality can be seen by considering $h(z) = z + 2z^{-1}$ which maps $\mathbb{H} \setminus A'$ onto $\mathbb{H}$. Therefore,

$$\text{hcap}[\mathcal{R}(i, 2)] < \frac{7}{2},$$

and hence

$$\frac{\text{hcap}(A)}{\text{hsiz}(A)} \leq \frac{7}{2\pi}.$$

□

References

- [1] G. Lawler, *Conformally Invariant Processes in the Plane*, American Mathematical Society, 2005.